

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COLUMBIA DIVISION

Phillip Samuel Copeland, #194023

Plaintiff,

v.

Warden White, Warden Broad River
Correctional Institution; Major Maxey;
L.T. Parrish; Officer Williams; and
Officer Evans,

Defendants.

C/A No. 3:04-22785-GRA-JRM

ORDER

[Written Opinion]

This matter is before the Court for a review of the magistrate's Report and Recommendation made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d), D.S.C., and filed May 10, 2005. Plaintiff brought this suit pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The defendants filed a motion for summary judgment on March 8, 2005. Plaintiff filed an affidavit in opposition to summary judgment on April 7, 2005. The magistrate recommends granting summary judgment to the defendants. For the reasons stated below, the Report and Recommendation is accepted and adopted in its entirety.

Plaintiff is proceeding *pro se*. This Court is required to construe *pro se* pleadings liberally. Such pleadings are held to a less stringent standard than those drafted by attorneys. *See Gordon v. Leeke*, 574 F.2d 1147, 1151 (4th Cir. 1978). This Court is charged with liberally construing a pleading filed by a *pro se* litigant to allow for the

development of a potentially meritorious claim. *See Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972).

The magistrate makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and responsibility for making a final determination remains with this Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). This Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made, and this Court may "accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). This Court may also "receive further evidence or recommit the matter to the magistrate with instructions." *Id.* In the absence of specific objections to the Report and Recommendation, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. *Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198 (4th. Cir. 1983). Plaintiff filed his objections May 23, 2005. Plaintiff does not state specific objections to the Report and Recommendation, instead restating his claim and stating that he is not in a position to prove those claims due to his confinement.

After a review of the magistrate's Report and Recommendation, this Court finds that the report is based upon the proper law. Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation is accepted and adopted in its entirety.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that defendants' motion for summary judgment is GRANTED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



G. ROSS ANDERSON, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Anderson, South Carolina

May 26, 2005.

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

Plaintiff has the right to appeal this Order within thirty (30) days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. Failure to meet this deadline, as modified by Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, will waive the right to appeal.